

home State of Tennessee—from Memphis to Mountain City—listening to the thoughts and concerns of private citizens and local officials. Coming directly from the private sector, I heard their message in the clearest possible terms, unfettered by the preconceived notions and prejudices of Washington.

And their message was: "Change the direction of the country. Get the Federal Government off our backs, out of our pockets, and off our land. The arrogance of Washington is stifling us, and we are capable of making our own decisions." A simple, crystal clear message.

Mr. President, this is the message I bring to Washington. And there is no better example of the Federal Government's arrogance and unwanted meddling than the unfunded Federal mandates. As our majority leader so eloquently pointed out in his opening remarks of the 104th Congress, the 10th amendment provides that powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the States are reserved to the States or to the people. Yet, through unfunded mandates, the Congress has forced its will upon the people by requiring State and local governments to pay for legislation over which they have no control. The result of these mandates is that local governments are forced to abandon their own priorities, to offer fewer services to the public, and to ultimately charge higher taxes and utility rates.

In my home State of Tennessee, for example, local officials from the city of Knoxville determined that they would have had an additional \$11 million to spend on local priorities in the absence of 10 unfunded Federal mandates. According to their estimates, Knoxville could have spent \$3.5 million for police and crime prevention were it not for these unfunded Federal mandates. Part of this money would have funded approximately 60 new police officers.

Examples such as these have been cited from cities across this country, from across America. It is essentially a problem of taxation without representation. That injustice helped bring about one revolution about 200 years ago, and I think on November 8 we saw another such revolution. The people have demanded that we put an end to such practice. The State and local battle cry, "no money, no mandates," has reached a fever pitch.

The test of any government is its responsiveness to its citizens. The solution to the problem of unfunded mandates is to require Congress to pay for any mandate it places on State and local governments.

Mr. President, I believe that Senate bill No. 1, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995, is a step in the right direction. It will be an effective but simple mechanism to curb the unfunded mandates that are strangling America's communities. Requiring Congress to pay for its mandates will merely require Congress to live in the real world. Like the rest of America, Congress will have to learn to balance

budgets, to provide services efficiently, to prioritize, and to make tough spending decisions.

For this reason, I have cosponsored the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. I commend Senator KEMPTHORNE for his leadership over the past 2 years in raising the awareness of lawmakers and the American public regarding the unfunded mandate issue. As Mayor Victor Ashe, of Knoxville, TN, currently president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and a champion of this cause has said: "This bill will begin to restore the partnership which the founders of the Nation intended to exist between the Federal Government and State and local governments."

However, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not say that there are aspects of this bill that can and should be improved. The bill has no effect on Congress unless the Congressional Budget Office first determines that a bill which contains an unfunded mandate will cost the State and local government more than \$50 million over a single year. While I am sure much thought has been given to this threshold amount, and while I understand that increased demands will be placed on the CBO, I urge my colleagues to listen a little more closely to the will of the people. Their message was not to limit unfunded Federal mandates, it was to eliminate them. I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to eliminating the \$50 million threshold in the bill.

The second provision of the bill which disturbs me is the provision that allows Congress to override the prohibition on unfunded Federal mandates with a simple majority vote in the Senate. In essence, what we give to the American people with one hand we potentially take away with the other. I urge that this provision be strengthened to require a supermajority of 60 votes to waive this legislation. Those two concerns notwithstanding, I believe this bill is a good step in the right direction.

Mr. President, the directive of November 8 is clear: A return to Federalism, the idea that power should be kept close to the people. I believe that the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, particularly if strengthened as I have urged, will go a long way toward saying to the American people that this body believes the people can and should be trusted with the power to make their own decisions. I urge my colleagues to strengthen and then pass this important piece of legislation as quickly as possible. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Idaho, after which I will then take no longer than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized.

A PLEDGE TO HELP

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you, Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding for a few moments. I appreciate a portion of her time.

Let me congratulate the Senator from Tennessee for a very clear message about why he came to Washington, reflective of the expectations of his constituency to respond to the issue of unfunded mandates. We will begin debate on that issue tomorrow, and it is exciting that my colleague, DIRK KEMPTHORNE, is the champion of that issue as we begin to address why the American public is so frustrated over what we do here, and this is one of the most effective ways of curbing it.

I also recognize my colleague from Colorado in his reintroduction of grazing law reform. I will join with him, and I have pledged, with my chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, that we will deal with this issue this year.

I have also appreciated the cooperation of the Secretary of the Interior. We have had several discussions over the last couple of months as he brings forth new rules and regulations that he would not deal with grazing fees per se and that he would offer some flexibility so that the authorizing committee could respond to the grazing industry and other interests out there that are concerned about the management of our public grass lands and how they will be grazed and under what policy they will be grazed.

For the balance of my brief time, let me suggest that there is a tactic underway, Mr. President, that while it may appear to be well directed, in my opinion, it is tremendously misguided. That is a tactic being used by the Democrat leadership at this moment to try to refocus the whole debate on a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution. There is that old adage that when you are out in the swamp surrounded by alligators, you are forgetting your initial purpose to come to the swamp was to drain it. That is exactly the tactic being used at this moment by the Democratic leadership in both Houses, to say: "For the next 7 years tell us every budget cut you are going to make. Let us be specific right down to the detail. What are you going to cut, and how are you going to cut the budget to arrive at a \$1.3 billion reduction in the budget to get to a balanced budget by 2002?"

That is phony. It is just as phony as can be to play that kind of game. What we have to talk about here is what we want to do first and how we want to do it, and then let us proceed down a path that will yield a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. SIMON. I commend the Senator for his comments. If the demands of those of us who favor a balanced budget amendment spell out how we do it, they are always making speeches how you can balance the budget without a constitutional amendment. It seems to me that it is incumbent on them to spell this out also. Is that being unrealistic?

Mr. CRAIG. Well, to my colleague from the other side, and one of the primary sponsors of the balanced budget amendment, it would not be unrealistic. But what is realistic to talk about is the very thing that all of us know who focus on the balanced budget amendment. And how we get there by the year 2002 is a simple matter—although complicated and very tough to do—of reducing the growth rate of Federal budgets from about 5 percent to about 3 percent. When the American public hears that, they say to a Senator SIMON of Illinois or a Senator CRAIG of Idaho, that sounds immensely reasonable. While it may be tough to do, it is a heck of a lot more reasonable to understand that is the kind of approach we are talking about. Then, apparently, the game plan, or the threat, there is the impending damage that could come from that kind of language that would suggest we have to cut \$1.3 trillion from budgets. What we could also say is that if we do not have a balanced budget amendment, by the year 2002 the Federal budget will be \$1.3 trillion larger, or that the Federal deficit will be \$500 or \$600 billion annually, or that the Federal debt will be \$6 or \$7 trillion, or that interest on the debt will be \$400 billion annualized.

That is not at all what they are talking about. Instead of talking about the kind of positive things that can grow and emanate from a balanced budget, they are talking about all of the negatives.

The American public knows exactly what we are saying and they are saying very clearly back to us: Do not get weak-kneed. Balance the Federal budget. Produce the mechanism that will result in that and give us a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that will force the kind of fiscal discipline that this Congress has failed to respond to for now over three decades.

Mr. President, this 104th Congress is considering a historic and remarkable balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Some partisan sparring broke out over the last few days. That's unfortunate.

Democrats have been asking Republicans, "Where's your plan?" specifically showing how to balance the budget by 2002?

Let us stay focused on the central issue. Which do we want: Balanced budgets or the status quo? Which do we want: An issue? Or passage of the balanced budget amendment? We know which is better for the country.

Let us remember what has brought us to this point: \$4.7 trillion Federal debt; annual deficits now in the \$160 billion range; and deficits projected to shoot toward \$400 billion after the turn of the century.

Let us stay above partisanship. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle sincerely support the balanced budget amendment but also are demanding to know specific budget cuts. I sympathize with your frustration; but don't be distracted.

Do not be fooled by a partisan tactics on the part of balanced budget amendment opponents to simply kill this amendment at any cost. Do not fall into that some old trap of trying to score a partisan point today at the cost of our children's economic well-being tomorrow. That is exactly the kind of shortsighted trade-off we're trying to stop by passing the balanced budget amendment.

The balanced budget amendment began as a bipartisan effort. Let us keep it that way.

Where are the specific cuts? There are literally hundreds of plans out there; there's no one way to balance the budget. What's lacking is some mechanism to force a consensus. There may be 100 plans in the Senate for balancing the budget, but not one of them will get 51 votes until we remove the easy alternative of borrow-and-spend.

Lessons of History: We have had the specific plans before us in the past. The way Congress has treated them demonstrates why we need to the balanced budget amendment. In the past, one/both Houses defeated numerous deficit-reduction plans full of specifics. Most recently, and in a bipartisan effort: Kerrey-Brown rescission/entitlement reform package (1994) (Penny-Kasich in the House, 1993).

"Draconian" budget cuts required? Contrary to what's being said, we know the direction we have to go, and how to get there. For example: "Glide Path" Plan: Federal spending is increasing now at about 5 percent, or about \$75 billion per year. Simply trimming that growth in spending to 3.1 percent would balance the budget in fiscal year 2002. For those concerned about Social Security: We can trim the growth of non-Social Security spending to 2.4 percent and still balance the budget by 2002. This will require discipline, but it is a far cry from the doom and gloom scenario being portrayed by many opponents.

Name every budget cut in advance? Opponents of this proposal want it both ways. First they say, show them how we would cut the budget. Next they say balancing the budget by 2002 would be too painful.

But this tactic proves our point: The budget won't be balanced without passing the BBA first. Democrats want our plan, but where has the Democrat plan been? President Clinton did not propose a path to a balanced budget—current projections show deficits going way up after 1995.

Bad Policy, putting the cart before the horse: When people decide they want to be healthier and live longer, they don't plan every meal and every workout for the next year. First they commit to do whatever is necessary. Then they pick the specific diet and exercise plan. The high failure rate for dieters illustrates our point that external enforcement is necessary. Specifying all the cuts before we even commit to balancing the budget condemns us to failure before we start.

Will the BBA work or won't it? Opponents cannot have it both ways: First, they say it is a fig leaf to cover budget failures in previous Congresses, that it's an empty promise; then they talk in terms of "slash and burn" to scare the interest groups into active opposition; I think they really do fear this amendment will work and are not willing to share the responsibilities.

Mr. President, I yield back to the Senator from Texas, and I thank her for sharing with me some of her time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON pertaining to the introduction of S. 191 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

A MESSAGE TO THE JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as I and a number of my colleagues spoke on the Senate floor this past Friday, we pointed out that a terrible injustice has been done to thousands of workers in my State of Iowa, Illinois, and in Ohio. It is an action that has ramifications not only for the other workers throughout our country, but for international relations as well.

Mr. President, I just want to say that if there are people at the Japanese Embassy here in Washington who have their sets tuned in to the proceedings in the Senate, I ask them to turn the volume up and pay close attention to what I am about to say. I believe I am joined by my colleague, Senator SIMON, from Illinois, we have a message for the Japanese Prime Minister who is in Washington today, meeting with the President of the United States. We have a very strong message for the Japanese Prime Minister. I hope that the people of the Japanese Embassy will turn their sets up and start to pay attention right now because this message is for the Japanese Prime Minister.

The Bridgestone-Firestone Corp. is a Japanese-owned company. It announced it would permanently replace